

COMMITTEE ON LEGISLATIVE RESEARCH  
OVERSIGHT DIVISION

**FISCAL NOTE**

L.R. NO. 2641-01  
BILL NO. HB 1511  
SUBJECT: Crimes and Punishment: Law Enforcement Officers  
TYPE: Original  
DATE: January 31, 2000

---

**FISCAL SUMMARY**

---

<b>ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON STATE FUNDS</b>			
FUND AFFECTED	FY 2001	FY 2002	FY 2003
None			
<b>Total Estimated Net Effect on <u>All</u> State Funds</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>

<b>ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON FEDERAL FUNDS</b>			
FUND AFFECTED	FY 2001	FY 2002	FY 2003
None			
<b>Total Estimated Net Effect on <u>All</u> Federal Funds</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>

<b>ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON LOCAL FUNDS</b>			
FUND AFFECTED	FY 2001	FY 2002	FY 2003
<b>Local Government</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>

Numbers within parentheses: ( ) indicate costs or losses  
This fiscal note contains 3 pages.

---

**FISCAL ANALYSIS**

**ASSUMPTION**

Officials from the **Office of Prosecution Services (OPS)** assume the proposed legislation could increase the workload of some county prosecutors; however, OPS assumes that any impact would be minimal and could be absorbed with existing resources.

Officials from the **Office of the State Public Defender (SPD)** assume that existing staff could represent the 20 to 30 additional cases that might arise as a result of this proposal. However, passage of more than one similar proposal could require the SPD to request increased appropriations to cover the cumulative cost of representing the indigent accused.

Officials from the **Office of State Courts Administrator (CTS)** assume the proposed legislation could result in additional criminal prosecutions; however, any increase would depend upon how the law is implemented by individual officers, departments and prosecutors. CTS assumes there would be an impact upon the budget of the judiciary if the proposal resulted in a significant number of additional prosecutions. CTS would not expect the increased costs to exceed \$100,000 in any year.

Based on the fiscal note responses from OPS and SPD, **Oversight** assumes that the increased workload on CTS would be minimal and could be absorbed with existing resources. Oversight further assumes that this proposal would likely result in substantial compliance.

In response to a similar proposal, officials from the **Office of the Attorney General** assumed there would be no fiscal impact on their agency.

Officials from the **Department of Public Safety** assume the proposal would have no fiscal impact on their agency.

<u>FISCAL IMPACT - State Government</u>	FY 2001 (10 Mo.)	FY 2002	FY 2003
	\$0	\$0	\$0

L.R. NO. 2641-01  
BILL NO. HB 1511  
PAGE 3 OF 3  
January 31, 2000

FISCAL IMPACT - Local Government

FY 2001 (10 Mo.)	FY 2002	FY 2003
\$0	\$0	\$0

FISCAL IMPACT - Small Business

No direct fiscal impact to small businesses would be expected as a result of this proposal.

DESCRIPTION

The proposal would make it a class A misdemeanor for any person present at the scene of an accident or other emergency to fail to obey the lawful order of a law enforcement officer.

This legislation is not federally mandated, would not duplicate any other program and would not require additional capital improvements or rental space.

SOURCES OF INFORMATION

Office of State Courts Administrator  
Office of Prosecution Services  
Office of the State Public Defender  
Office of the Attorney General  
Department of Public Safety



Jeanne Jarrett, CPA  
Director  
January 31, 2000